R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 070 24

A STUDY OF DELIBERATE INSTRUCTION WITHIN FAMILY UNITS.

BY- HAGSTROM, WARREN O.
WISCONSIN UNIV., MADISON

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-184 PUB DATE JUN 65
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.16 79P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PARENT ROLE, *FAMILY INFLUENCE, INSTRUCTION, MOTOR SKILLS, LEARNING PROCESSES, MADISON, WISCONSIN

THIS IS AN ANECDOTAL STUDY BASED UPON PUBLISHED WORKS OF BIOGRAPHERS, HISTORIANS, AND ETHNOGRAPHERS PLUS UNCONTROLLED AND UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEWS AND REMINISCENCES OF PEOPLE WHO REPORTED EXPERIENCES IN TRYING TO TEACH MEMBERS OF THEIR FAMILIES. THE STUDY WAS ENTIRELY EXPLORATORY AND DEVOTED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES ABOUT THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH FAMILY MEMBERS CAN INSTRUCT ONE ANOTHER IN COMPLEX SKILLS. ONE SUCH HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPED WAS THAT INSTRUCTION IN THE FAMILY IS LIKELY TO GENERATE INTERPERSONAL STRAINS. SEVERAL EXPERIMENTAL HYPOTHESES WERE GENERATED WHICH MAY EVENTUALLY BE PUT TO EMPIRICAL TEST. (JK)

ED003070

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

S-18

A STUDY OF DELIBERATE INSTRUCTION WITHIN FAMILY UNITS

Cooperative Research Project No. S-184

By

Warren O. Hagstrom

University of Wisconsin

Madison, Wisconsin

June 1965

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

ED 003070

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	PROBLEM	1
II.	OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURE	1
III.	ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	2
	ETHNOGRAPHIC DATA	4
	HISTORICAL DATA: MORAL INSTRUCTION IN THE ARISTOCRATIC HOUSEHOLD	17
	THE PARENT AS TEACHER: THEORETICAL ANALYSIS	25
	ILLUSTRATIVE EVIDENCE FOR HYPOTHESES	41
	The Family and the School	41
	Early Readers	43
	Alien Environments	47
	Some Successful Cases	49
	Music Teachers	56
	Driving Instruction	59
	Summary	64
	Notes to Analysis and Conclusions	64
IV.	IMPLICATIONS OF THIS RESEARCH	65
V.	REFERENCES	71

LIST OF TABLES

1.	NON-FAMILIAL INSTRUCTION (HERZOG) BY POLITICAL INTEGRATION AND RELIGION	13
2.	FOUR RELATED TYPES OF ACTIVITIES IN PATTERN VARIABLE TERMS	27
3.	RELATIVE STRAIN IN DRIVING INSTRUCTION BY SEX AND RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENT AND TEACHER	60

I. PROBLEM

Under what conditions can family members deliberately instruct one another in complex motor or mental skills? What are the consequences of attempts at such instruction for family relations and the personalities of family members? By "deliberate instruction" I mean situations where one person consciously seeks to give another competence in certain skills and knowledge and where this is neither incidental to practical activities nor part of play or games. By "complex skills" I mean motor skills such as driving an automobile or sailing a boat, or conceptual skills, such as reading, or such other skills as performing music.

II. OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES

The study reported here has been exploratory. I have attempted to conceptualize the problem, to determine the range of variation in familial instruction and variables associated with it, and to discover hypotheses to account for variations in familial instruction among different societies and within our own society.

As befits exploratory research, the procedures have been kept as flexible as possible. I have relied heavily on previous published work, not only the work of educational researchers but that of historians, ethnographers, and biographers. Secondary analyses of two previous surveys have been conducted. In addition, I and my students have conducted unstructured interviews with samples of married adults, of college students, and of music instructors.

III. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The economist Richard Stone has written the following about the problem of defining the "educational system" of a nation:

> As with the economy at large, it is convenient to draw the educational boundary so as to exclude the educative effects of family members on one another; these may be regarded as a part of life in general for which we do not try to account . . . . As in the case of social accounting, family activities are excluded not because they are unimportant but because they are not the subject of general policy decisions and because they are virtually unrecorded. (Stone, 1965)

Stone's statements are true, but it is not obvious that they are necessarily true. It would be possible to measure familial contributions to education with modern survey techniques, and it might be possible for educational planners to formulate policies that would increase familial contributions to education. Such policies might seem farfetched now, but they need not be in the future, when a majority of parents in nations like the United States will have themselves received a college education. In the future some policy planners may attempt to make greater use of family resources in education. If they do, they must consider the distinctive characteristics of the family as an educational agency, its distinctive advantages and limitations. For the present we can ask ourselves, why does not the family play a greater role in education? Three types of hypotheses can be considered.

First, it might be argued that parents do teach their children within the limits of their own skills and knowledge, but that most "school subjects" go beyond these skills and knowledge (Parsons, 1959, p. 309).

While this type of hypothesis is plausible - especially in societies where a large proportion of parents are themselves illiterate - I shall show that it is mistaken. Even when parents are themselves professional teachers, they often find it impossible to teach their own children.

A second type of hypothesis might be that parents are not motivated to teach their own children. While this is probably true of many parents in traditional societies or in the culturally deprived sectors of our own society, it seems quite implausible for middle class parents in our society, and it can be shown to be false among them. Nevertheless, it is suggestive: we should distinguish between the "educational aspirations for children" of parents and their "motivation to teach" them.

The third type of hypothesis is that systematic instruction in families is seldom possible because it conflicts with other facets of parent-child relationships. This is the type of hypothesis that will be elaborated and defended here. It cannot, however, be a simple hypothesis, since parent-child relations vary greatly; the nature of the potential "role conflict" cannot be the same in all families. In some families it is possible for parents to be effective teachers; some children acquire high proficiency in complex skills from their parents.

In the following analysis I shall first consider information on teaching in family contexts which can be obtained from the work of historians and anthropologists. Then I shall develop a theory of instruction in the family and present evidence from studies of contemporary American society to illustrate the theory. Finally, I shall discuss the implications of this for educational policy planning.

ETHNOGRAPHIC DATA

Many societies make no arrangements for "education" outside the nuclear family of parents and children. Complex skills in hunting, agriculture, construction, religion, and other subjects are transmitted to children largely from parents. Thus, such societies should be excellent "natural experiments" for the study of systematic instruction in family settings. However, an extensive search of ethnographic studies reveals that very little attention has been devoted to the subject by anthropologists. In their detailed and extensive studies of infant and child care, one can find meticulous descriptions of weaning and toilet training, punishment, patterns of deference, children's work and play, but few references to instruction in complex skills. The reason for this is clear: <u>In societies without schools, instruction in complex skills (and in general) is not differentiated from other social activities.</u> If children learn, they learn as an incidental aspect of their play, or productive work, or even more casually. Raymond Firth's description of education among the Tikopia is typical:[1]

> /Education/ is not an imagined preparation for social life but is actually a vital part of it, hinging upon the participation of the child in all ordinary activities from early years, and arising out of the inevitable lacunae in its knowledge when called upon to face practical situations. The observer is impressed almost immediately by the absence of any institutionalized education. . . . Specific spheres in the education of a child are instruction in the manners and moral rules of the society, training in arts and crafts and imparting knowledge

> of traditional lore and ritual formulae. Formal lessons are rarely given in these departments, but advice, explanation and commands tend to cluster around the performance of any activity, or the onset of any social situation. (Firth, 1957, pp. 134f.)

It is worth noting that of the seven pages Firth sets apart for "education," the larger part is devoted to education in matters of etiquette, decorum, and kinship behavior. This is typical of ethnographic accounts of education.

By generalizing from these preliterate societies, we obtain the following hypothesis: when education is carried on successfully in families, it occurs as an incidental aspect of play or productive work. Such "education" is evidently quite effective.[2] However, the fact remains that we do not know why education in families takes only these forms. An answer may be obtained if the question is turned around. Under what conditions is education in the family found wanting? Why do societies establish schools?

There are at least three somewhat different anthropological answers to these questions. The first was advanced by Margaret Mead, who argued that the introduction of schools (or, more generally, extra-familial instruction) into a society followed the development of social classes and similar status divisions and was caused by this stratification (Mead, 1943). Stratification creates the possibility of a difference in social rank between parent and child. Then, according to Mead, the

> possibility of shift of class position by virtue of a different educational experience becomes articulately recognized, so that individuals seek not only to better their children or to

> guard them against educational defect but also to see the extension or restriction of educational opportunity as relevant to the whole class structure. . .

Modern societies accept the potential discontinuity between parents and children, although many parents and children may be threatened by it. Education is akin to religious or political conversion, to assimilation, or to successful colonization in its relation to such discontinuities. In any case, real or potential discontinuities mean that parents are not considered able to teach their own children; some extra-familial agency is required. While in the modern world this agency is usually the secular school, in stratified pre-industrial societies it may be a religious organization, a "bush school," or a lineage organization.

A second hypothesis about the origins of schools can be obtained by generalizing the argument made by the historian Bernard Bailyn with regard to American schools (Bailyn, 1960, pp. 15-25). He argued that the function of education was discharged by the "extended patrilineal family" in 17th century England. The "patriarchal" joint household, including a patriarch, his married sons, and their children, forming a group well integrated in the larger community, had the resources and the power to perform essential educational functions. (Bailyn is mistaken in describing the 17th century English family as "patrilineal," and he is also mistaken in saying that England was essentially without "schools" at this time. (See Herzog, 1962, p. 316.) For various reasons the large extended family could not be maintained in the American environment; instead there developed the family system we have today, the "isolated nuclear family" of parents and children, who live in a household of their own with few formal ties to other kin. A family of this type lacked the resources to

educate its own children. Compared with the extended family, it lacked the distribution of skills, the leisure, and the power over the children. Thus, in the American environment, schools were developed to fill the gap left by the decline of the extended family. More generally, one can advance the hypothesis that extra-familial educational institutions will tend to be present in societies in which the extended family is weak and the nuclear family is relatively isolated.

This hypothesis has been tested by John D. Herzog using cross-cultural data (Herzog, 1962). Herzog studied ethnographic reports of 119 societies and classified them by type of instructional system, type of family, political integration, and still other variables. He recognized three classes of "deliberate instruction":

Type I: deliberate instruction by kin, with or without change of residence.

Type II: deliberate instruction by non-kin, without change of residence required.

Type III: deliberate instruction by non-kin, with change of residence required.

Herzog found Type I instruction present in 59 per cent of 79 societies for which information was available. In view of the remarks above about the lack of information on this account by ethnographers, this seems suspiciously high; Herzog himself reported that the scoring of Type I instruction was "intuitively unsatisfactory," and he did not present an analysis of this variable. Type II instruction characterizes our own society, but analogous forms are also found in pre-literate societies. Type III instruction is usually connected with initiation ceremonies of primitive societies.

The cross-cultural data show that the hypothesis extracted from the work of Bailyn is invalid. Type II instruction, "extra-familial deliberate instruction," is less likely to be present in societies in which the nuclear family is relatively isolated and more likely to be found in societies with strong extended families. Even so, the correlation between type of family and type of instruction is smaller than the correlation between "political integration" and type of instruction; the former correlation is greatly reduced when political integration is held constant. Herzog concludes,

> Politically complex societies, no matter their household type, tend to use [extra-familial] deliberate instruction; politically simple societies get along without it. (Herzog, 1962, p. 319)

Political integration goes along with social stratification, and these results thus tend to confirm Mead's hypothesis about schools. Herzog, however, seeks a psychological explanation of the correlations. Basically he argues that the family household structure - the role of extended kin, residence rules, the economic roles of mothers, and the presence or absence of polygyny - plays a large role in determining psychological relations between parents and children. Extra-familial deliberate instruction may serve the function of weakening the dependency of children on their parents (or, more particularly, their mothers). This can be stated most clearly for Type III instruction, extra-familial instruction with a change of residence. In many societies children live with their mothers apart from their fathers; this is common in polygynous societies and is also present when illegitimacy rates are very high. Given this

type of "mother-child" household, Type III instruction is very likely to be found. Given Type III instruction, more or less severe initiation ceremonies will be found. Type III instruction has the same function as the initiation ceremony: it reduces the boy's dependence upon and identification with his mother, which is likely to be especially strong and problematical in this type of family system.

Herzog has attempted to extend a theory of initiation ceremonies to the educational context. The theory of initiation ceremonies is itself suspect and is the subject of numerous polemical articles.[3] Furthermore, Herzog's study exemplifies many of the serious defects of the cross-cultural approach (Cf. Zelditch, 1964). The most serious of these is the placement of grossly different phenomena into the same class. Thus, the West African bush school (Watkins, 1963) as well as the English Eton are both "Type III instruction," and the American public school and the Kikuyu initiation school are both "Type II instruction." Even so, different persons reading the same ethnographic accounts classify a society differently: the scheme is relatively unreliable (Herzog, 1962, p. 309). The sampling procedure treats as "independent cases" societies which may very well have influenced one another; thus, Herzog's sample includes both the Serbs and the Bulgarians, both the Tlingit and the Yurok (Indians of the Northwest American coast). An example of the type of problem this produces is Herzog's classification of the Mixtecans (a Mexican Indian people) as a society in which Type II instruction is present. The ethnographic account (in B. Whiting, 1963) clearly indicates that the Mixtecans have been compelled to send their children to school by Mexican government authorities. A final defect this study shares with other cross-cultural studies is its attribution of "stability" to societies

undergoing rapid change; colonization and industrialization have been transforming educational practices for two centuries or longer in many of the societies in Herzog's sample, but the possibility of change is neglected in his classification procedures.

Despite these serious defects, Herzog's study is valuable as a pioneering study in an important substantive area. More important, his theory may contain a large element of truth: an important latent function of schools may be to make children less dependent on their parents. As Herzog points out, the importance of this function, and the way in which it is performed, will depend upon the nature of the family; this should hold true both between societies and within a particular society (Herzog, 1962, pp. 333-336).

The anthropological data referred to in the preceding pages can be summarized in the following three propositions:

1. In societies without schools, instruction within families is seldom "deliberate" but occurs in the course of ordinary work and in play and games.

2. Societies are likely to establish schools or other forms of extra-familial instruction when they reach a stage of complexity such that children will often play different adult roles than their parents; this stage is typically associated with the development of social classes and some degree of political centralization.

3. Education in the family is likely to be associated with the prolonged emotional dependence of children on their parents (either both parents or, in some cases, the mother); schools and other forms of extra-familial education, like initiation ceremonies, may have the function of attenuating this dependency.

These hypotheses emerge from a relatively gross and superficial comparison of societies with and societies without schools. Some anthropologists have given us more detailed reports of schools in more or less primitive and traditional societies. These reports lead to a qualification and extension of the hypotheses just stated.

First, the idea that schools exist because parents are themselves not proficient in essential skills is supported by the critical role of reading and writing in the schools of primitive societies. (Language instruction plays an important role in the schools of all societies; see Broudy, 1963, p. 3.) Learning to read and write are the major skills learned (if they are learned), and most children do not continue their education beyond this elementary stage. These skills are the clearest examples of "impractical" skills for children. A child's ability to read is unlikely to help his family perform the adaptive tasks of an agrarian or extractive society; even if the skills were potentially useful, they would probably be useful only if the child were to be given a leadership or an expert role, and this is unlikely to occur. Thus, reading is taught the child to benefit him at some indefinite future time; his family will benefit indirectly, if at all. Literacy cannot be acquired merely by participating in work and play. This aspect of literacy training makes it fit quite well with Margaret Mead's hypothesis about the social function of schools: the child must learn to read in order to play a potentially <u>different</u> role from his parents. It is also true that the literacy of a society is associated with its political centralization and its stratification. Claude Levi-Strauss writes that:

> Of all the criteria by which people habitually distinguish civilization from barbarism, [writing] should be the one most

> worth retaining: that certain peoples write and others do not . . . . Yet nothing of what we know of writing, or of its role in evolution, can be said to justify this conception. . . . If we want to correlate the appearance of writing with certain other characteristics of civilization, we must look elsewhere [than at agrarian technology, animal husbandry, or even architecture]. The one phenomenon which has invariably accompanied it is the formation of cities and empires: the integration into a political system, that is to say, of a considerable number of individuals, and the distribution of those individuals into a hierarchy of castes and classes. . . . If my hypothesis is correct, the primary function of writing, as a means of communication, is to facilitate the enslavement of other human beings. (Levi-Strauss, 1964, pp. 291f.)

If Herzog is correct, and the development of schools is more strongly correlated with the political centralization of societies than any other variable, the specific instructional tasks of the schools will be in the area of literacy. Herzog's own sample of societies can be used to test this type of hypothesis. While the ethnographic data do not give the extent of literacy in societies, a crude indicator of the importance of literacy is the presence or absence of a "book religion" - Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, or Hinduism. Preindustrial societies without book religions are also likely to be without literacy.

I have taken the 88 societies for which Herzog had information on Type II instruction and political integration and classified them for presence or absence of a "book religion." This classification was based on general knowledge of culture areas; in only a few cases have I had

access to the ethnographic sources used by Herzog, although I did refer to Murdock's World Ethnographic Sample (Murdock, 1957). Fifteen societies were not classified because I could not be sure if the ethnographic report Herzog used was dated prior to conversion from a more primitive religion or at a later date. There may very well be serious errors in my classification. Nevertheless, the data presented in Table 1 show that religion is much more highly associated with Type II instruction than is political integration.

Table 1. TYPE II INSTRUCTION (HERZOG) BY POLITICAL INTEGRATION AND RELIGION

Political Integration**	Fraction with Type II instruction (numerator: societies with Type II instruction; denominator: number of societies in category)*					
	Religion					
	Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism	No Great Religion	Not Classified	Total		
Highly integrated	14/14	0/3	2/4	76%	16/21	
Moderately integrated	6/7	5/15	1/5	44%	12/27	
Low integration	1/1	10/33	1/6	30%	12/40	
Total	95% 21/22	29% 15/51	27% 4/15	45%	40/88	

* Percentages given for total row and column.

** Highly integrated: Herzog's category S, large state.
Moderately integrated: Herzog's categories L, M, little or small state.
Low integration: Herzog's categories A, D, O. P, no states or dependent societies.

Only one of the societies classified as having a book religion, the Rwala Bedouin of Arabia, were not classified as having Type II instruction. (The other exceptional case in that column is the society with low

political integration; this is the Telegu of India, actually a dependent part of a larger, well organized political system.) A glance at the total row and the total column shows that religion has a larger correlation with Type II instruction than political integration; this difference is not contradicted by the data within rows or columns. The data are clearly suggestive of the importance of literacy as opposed to political organization or household structure.

A second insight into the relations between schools and families that is provided by detailed ethnographic reports concerns the assistance given by the family to the school. Most reports suggest that parents are either unable or unwilling to assist children with school work. This might be expected of education in "colonial" circumstances. For example, the education of Mixtecan Indian children in Mexico provides for the Indian children a clear demonstration of their inferiority and subordination to their Mexican schoolmates. It is no surprise to learn that "only about half of the barrio's school-age children go to school at all, and even those who do attend do so irregularly!"(in B. Whiting, 1963, p. 569). Similarly, children on Truk under the Japanese mandate had to be compelled by officials to attend school; neither parents nor children usually valued the skills taught (mostly Japanese language skills), and neither appreciated the unaccustomed discipline (Fischer, 1963). But even in societies where parents do not oppose the goals of the schools, reports of assistance with homework, or even coercion to perform homework, are absent. (See the reports on the Gusii of Kenya, the Rajputs of NW India, the Tarong of the Philippines, and villagers in Okinawa, in B. Whiting, 1963.)

Parents are not necessarily indifferent to the school success or failure of their children. Usually, however, success and failure are

not clearly marked. Societies with strong extended families evidently do not encourage competitiveness in children, and their schools usually do not do so either. Herzog notes his impression that schools in such societies have a "very different flavor" than our own. "'Rote learning' is emphasized; the status differential between teacher and pupil is relatively larger; a variety of levels of achievement is not recognized, as a rule, all students striving to meet the same tradition-decreed goals." (Herzog, 1962, p. 326.) A common pedagogical technique is for the entire class as a whole to recite in unison with or for the teacher.

When failure is clearly marked, parents tend to react either fatalistically or with hostility against the child. The Rajput villagers of Northwest India, where the joint household is extremely strong, evidently do not believe that a child's school success is greatly influenced by his own endeavors; hence, they do little to prevent truancy (in B. Whiting, 1963, pp. 298 and 358). Among the Gusii of Kenya, on the other hand, failure in school (of one of the few boys sent to school) is viewed as disloyalty:

> When asked which of their children they would choose to send [to school], parents answer, 'The most obedient child.' No mention is made of specifically intellectual qualities, such as ability to learn. Parents seem to view schooling as a series of commands by the teacher which, if they are obeyed by the child, result in success. Failure is attributed to disobedience rather than to stupidity. (Levine and Levine in B. Whiting, 1963, p. 125)

These reactions are what might be expected if relations between parents and children revolve around deep emotional commitments in which

the application of general standards of performance is difficult. The same types of parental reaction may occur in more modern societies. In contemporary Israel, learning to read was, until recently, prerequisite for advancing from grade one to grade two; about a quarter of the grade one pupils of lower socio-economic background had to repeat first grade. Parents typically reacted with shock to this failure; many blamed the child, even to the point of extreme rejection, some blamed the school, and some few blamed themselves (Smilansky and Adar, 1961, pp. 5, 9ff.) If these reactions are a serious problem when schooling is largely segregated from family life, they would undoubtedly be a much more serious problem if parents themselves attempted to instruct children in complex skills such as reading.

The importance of reading and writing in the schools of traditional societies at first seems to provide support for the hypothesis that extra-familial instruction exists to train children in skills in which the parents are not adept. A closer examination, however, leads to a qualification of this point of view. The importance of reading lies not only in the fact that parents are not skilled in it, but in the fact that reading cannot readily be learned as an incidental aspect of work or play. When reading is taught in schools, parents are not likely to become highly involved; school learning and family life are segregated, so segregated, in fact, that the motivation of students to learn is so low as to produce serious problems for the school. If the parent does become involved because of the child's failure, he is likely to react by attributing disobedience to the child.

HISTORICAL DATA: MORAL INSTRUCTION IN THE ARISTOCRATIC HOUSEHOLD

Societies without schools have been considered as one natural experiment for the study of deliberate instruction in family settings. A similar experiment is provided by the aristocratic family of the West from Ancient Greece to the present day. These families usually existed in societies with schools, but the resources of the families have been such that instruction could be carried on in the household - by the parent and by the tutor, who has often been as emotionally close to the child as the parent himself. Although aristocratic families have not been "typical," examination of them may provide insights into the nature of the family as an educational institution.

The aristocratic family has had a number of distinctive features relevant to the education of its children. First, marriages are often arranged for the good of the larger family group; these arranged marriages have often been associated with emotional distance between husbands and wives and an almost institutionalized mistress role. Second, these families have been able to delegate to servants many of the tasks usually performed by parents. Third, sons often have been almost assured of rights to succeed their fathers, and this has been associated with rebelliousness; England's Henry V, the Prince Hal of Shakespeare, was not an unusual case.

Taken together, these characteristics have led to highly formal relations between parents and children. They are probably associated with the distinction between "moral instruction" (Eriziehung, formation) and "technical education" (Unterricht, instruction) - a distinction still of great importance in European educational thought. (See Metraux, 1963, and Broudy, 1963.) The aristocratic child must be brought up to be

loyal to the "house" whose interests he can so easily harm and to the upper status group of which he is a member. Until boarding schools were developed, he was usually brought up by specialists employed by his father for these purposes. Teaching roles in aristocratic education are divided between "personal tutors" and "technical instructors." The child has first a tutor or "friend," usually of reputable status, who, however, does not engage in the deliberate instruction of complex skills. Those who teach complex skills usually have low status. Let us consider some of the historical variations in these two roles.

"Personal tutors" have often been emotionally close to their charges. For example, the biographer of the 17th century English Dukes of Bedford has written:

> It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the part played in family history by such men as [the Reverend John Thornton, tutor of the household's children]. At all times there must have been many tutors whose influence counted infinitely more in moulding the character of their pupils than did that of the father or mother. (Thomson, 1959, p. 72)

The biographer also notes that "In the schoolroom the tutor was supreme." If this can be taken to mean that the tutor directly instructed his charges in skills such as reading, mathematics, and foreign languages, it presents a clear challenge to the thesis advanced here, that instruction in complex skills cannot readily be given by parents or even quasi-parental figures. In fact, however, tutors like John Thornton were probably not engaged in such "menial" tasks. The tutor saw to the employment of specialized instructors in complex skills: writing masters, dancing masters, fencing masters, and so forth; and he supervised the instruction

they gave. He would be interested in the academic progress of his charges, and he would select books for them to read. But he was primarily interested in the moral development of the children; he watched for signs of poor manners, spendthrift behavior, and the like, and took whatever steps necessary to correct them. (Cf. Aries, 1962, pp. 194, 269, 270.) (The division of labor in child rearing between the tutor and his employer is an interesting topic, but it cannot be gone into here.)

In families less wealthy than the Dukes of Bedford, the personal tutor was probably compelled to be the technical instructor as well. Probably such tutors were not emotionally close to their students. Outside of novels like Fielding's Tom Jones, I have not discovered reports of such families.

Similar roles have been present throughout Western history. In ancient Greece, the relation between tutor and taught was not so much quasi-paternal as erotic:

> The family could not be the educational centre. The wife was kept in the background: she was considered fit enough to look after the baby, but no more; when the child was seven, it was taken out of her hands. As for the father, he was absorbed in public affairs, for we must not forget that we are speaking of what was originally an aristocracy. . . . [It] is not surprising that Plato should . . . declare quite bluntly that the relationship of pederasty establishes between the two lovers 'a union far closer' than that which binds parents to their children.
>
> Nor could the work of education be carried on at school. In the earliest times schools did not exist, and when they

> did come into being they always tended to be looked upon rather contemptuously, because the masters were paid for their services and the school itself existed merely to give technical instruction, not education. . . . For the Greeks, education - paideia - meant, essentially, a profound and intimate relationship, a personal union between a young man and an elder who was at once his model, his guide and his initiator - a relationship on to which the fire of passion threw warm and turbid reflections. . . . Pederasty was considered the most beautiful, the perfect, form of education. . . , Throughout Greek history the relationship between master and pupil was to remain that between a lover and his beloved: education remained in principle not so much a form of teaching, an instruction in techniques, as an expenditure of loving effort by an elder concerned to promote the growth of a younger man who was burning with the desire to respond to this love and show himself worthy of it. (Marrou, 1964, pp. 56f.)

We need not accept Marrou's explanation of this pattern (in terms of the involvement of the father in public affairs) to accept his description of the situation: the aristocratic child was emotionally close to a "tutor" who, however, was not primarily concerned with instruction in complex skills.[4]

Those actually engaged in the teaching of complex skills were held in low esteem. In ancient Greece they were likely to be downwardly mobile and ill paid.

> . . . the fundamental reason for the contempt in which the

> teaching profession was held was that it required no special qualifications. Nowhere was it thought necessary for schoolteachers to undergo professional training like that given in our modern teachers' training colleges. . . . Except for moral assurances about good character and honourable conduct, it seems that no guarantees were demanded: technically, anyone who could read was considered capable of setting himself up as a teacher - he simply had to remember what he had learnt at school. (Marrou, 1964, pp. 204f.)

The same was true in Rome (Marrou, 1964, pp. 361, 370, 403f.). With the advent of Christianity, the status of teachers rose, because, I suggest, they became associated with moral and religious rather than merely technical instruction (Marrou, 1964, p. 450). But in the Middle Ages and Renaissance the technical instructor - a secular master for such skills as reading, writing, dancing, and fencing - still had the low status of a tradesman. Such trades were caught up in the guild movement of the later middle ages, sometimes with amusing results. For example, there were separate guilds of schoolmasters, who taught reading, and scribes, who taught writing; jurisdictional disputes between the two were common (Aries, 1962, pp. 296ff.).

These teachers either instructed young children, a task associated with lower prestige in almost every society, or they taught older children and youths, more or less at the demand of the students. The flow of demand in instruction is a useful concept, and I shall return to it later. Information, requests, complaints, or orders may either issue from the teacher to the student or the other way around. With young children the flow of demand is likely to be from the teacher to the student;

problems of discipline may be serious. In aristocratic instruction, a personal tutor may assure obedience by the student to the technical instructor and protect the student from harsh physical punishment. With older students, the flow of demand in instruction may be reversed. This seems to happen infrequently, although it may have been common in aristocratic instruction. Since the source of demands usually has higher status than the recipient (Homans, 1950), this would further contribute to the low status of the teacher. However, it would probably also serve to reduce interpersonal strains in instruction.

The technical instruction of aristocratic children was in all likelihood not carried on in familial or even quasi-familial contexts. Furthermore, however, the existence of the personal tutor role suggests that moral instruction was not given entirely in familial contexts but that much of it was given in quasi-familial contexts. The tutor was a member of the aristocratic household and was a quasi-parental figure, but he was not a parent.

The same pattern is manifested in the "apprenticeship" of aristocrats. Philippe Aries has pointed out that in the middle ages even aristocratic children were sent away (often abroad) to serve families in other homes - "serve" in the literal sense of waiting on tables and performing other similar activities. Aries quotes an Italian observer of the English in the late fifteenth century, who says "few are born who are exempted from this fate" of menial labor in the homes of others, "for everyone, however rich he may be, sends away his children into the houses of others, whilst he, in return, receives those of strangers into his own." The Italian considered this pattern cruel and suggested that the English did so because they thought they could get better service

from the children of others than from their own. Aries suggests that "this way of life was probably common in the West during the Middle Ages," - even in Italy - and that its goal and function was what the English said it was: "In order that their children might learn better manners." (Aries, 1962, p. 365)

Why should this be so? The hypothesis advanced here is that instruction in the family is likely to generate interpersonal strains. This is especially likely to be true of instruction in technical skills, but it must be remembered that "manners" and "deportment" tend almost to be viewed as technical skills in aristocratic circles. In addition, the practice of apprenticeship may have served the function of reducing the dependency of children on their parents. (This may be a more serious problem for sons who succeed to the role of their fathers.)

The extension of education in schools (especially residential schools) almost eliminated this form of apprenticeship by the late eighteenth century, although it continued in the working classes well into the nineteenth century. The interpersonal aspects of working class apprenticeship deserve more intensive study. It is often suggested that the master-apprentice relation was almost identical with the parent-child relation; for example, Bernard Bailyn describes seventeenth century English apprenticeship in the following terms:

> Like other forms of bonded servitude, it was a condition of dependency, a childlike state of legal incompetence, in which the master's role, and responsibilities, was indistinguishable from the father's, and the servant's obligations were as total, as moral, and as personal as the son's. Servants of almost every degree were included within the family, and

> it was the family's discipline that most directly enforced the condition of bondage. The master's parental concern for his servants, and especially for apprentices, included care for their moral welfare as well as for their material condition. (Bailyn, 1960, p. 17)

The point of view advanced here suggests that such descriptions must be mistaken; the master was a quasi-parental figure and could probably give certain types of instruction with less interpersonal strain than an actual parent. (The rest of Bailyn's argument, that the decline of apprenticeship in the American colonies was a cause of the development of American school education, may very well be valid, however. Bailyn, 1960, pp. 29-36.)

In summary, an inspection of the education of aristocrats does not show that parents or quasi-parental figures usually gave instruction in technical skills. Aristocratic families were no more likely to be "schools" than the families in preliterate societies without schools. Furthermore, even moral instruction in aristocratic families involved a complex division of labor, with personal tutors, lower status technical instructors, and apprenticeships in other families. Tutors and apprenticeships may have had the function of reducing the dependency of sons on their parents - to the effect that the son could later on enact a family role which was at one with a political role in society. In this respect, these practices were similar in function to initiation ceremonies in primitive societies and schools in many societies. (These functions are more important for males than for females. Women are often expected to be dependent personalities, so nothing would be served by having them undergo initiation ceremonies, apprenticeships, or education in schools.)

In no society and in no extensive stratum within a society has it been the practice for parents to deliberately instruct their children in complex skills. Some causes for this have been alluded to in the foregoing. In the following pages I shall first develop a more extensive theory relating parental and teaching roles, and I shall then consider data from contemporary societies which may have some bearing on this theory.

THE PARENT AS TEACHER: THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

The theoretical perspective to be developed here will rely primarily upon the works of Talcott Parsons, although I shall disregard some of Parsons' ideas about the family and deal in a cursory fashion with others. This is not the only theoretical perspective that could be used, but, given Parsons' eclecticism, other perspectives are easily related to his own. Some will be mentioned in passing.

Any society or smaller social system must solve four "system problems." A social system must: (1) adapt to its social and physical environment (adaptation), (2) select and attain goals in the environment, (3) integrate its component units, and (4) maintain and transmit commitments to values among its component units (pattern-maintenance) and control tensions within the units. Both the family and the educational system "specialize" in pattern-maintenance and tension management, although the family, especially in pre-industrial societies, performs all four functions for the larger society. Despite this similarity in function, family and school are quite different in ways which can conveniently be summarized in terms of Parsons' "pattern-variables."

"A <u>pattern variable</u> is a dichotomy, one side of which must be chosen

by an actor before the meaning of a situation is determinate for him, and thus before he can act with respect to that situation." (Parsons and Shils, 1954, p. 77) While pattern variables are most specifically defined for the single action, they may be extended to roles and groups; we may say that a role is "primarily" characterized by one pattern alternative rather than another.. There are five pattern variables:

(1) Affectivity-Affective neutrality. The dilemma of gratification of impulse versus discipline. To what extent is the actor willing to defer gratification?

(2) Universalism-Particularism. "The dilemma of transcendence versus immanence. . . In confronting any situation, the actor faces the dilemma whether to treat the objects in the situation in accordance with a general norm covering <u>all</u> objects in that class or whether to treat them in accordance with their standing in some particular relationship to him or to his collectivity. . ." (Parsons and Shils, 1954, p. 81) Universalism refers to the primacy of "cognitive standards," particularism refers to the primacy of "appreciative standards."

(3) Performance-Quality. Should the actor treat the other person in the light of what he is in himself or in the light of what he does or what might flow from his actions? Qualities include possessions and group memberships; statuses are ascribed through qualities. Performances may refer to past, present, or prospective actions; statuses are achieved through performances. Personality attributes such as intelligence, or "good looks," are considered qualities in so far as they are not important as <u>direct</u> conditions of a relevant performance. (Parsons, 1950, p. 92)

(4) Diffuseness-Specificity. The dilemma of the scope of significance of the object: Should the actor accept no inherent or prior

limitations of his expectations of and obligations to the other, or should he accord only a limited and specific type of significance to him?

(5) Self-orientation - Collectivity-orientation. Will the actor give primacy to the interests, goals, and values shared with the other members of a given collective unit of which he is a member as against his personal or private interests?

Consider now the following activities in terms of the pattern variables: family expressive activities; family adaptive (instrumental) activities; family games; and deliberate instruction in complex skills. These activities can be classified in pattern variable terms largely on the basis of common knowledge of them.[5] My classification is presented in Table 2, and a discussion follows.

Table 2. FOUR RELATED TYPES OF ACTIVITIES IN PATTERN VARIABLE TERMS

Pattern Variable	Family Expression	Family Adaptation	Family Game	Technical Instruction
Affectivity-Neutrality	Affectivity	Neutrality	Neutrality*	Neutrality
Universalism-Particularism	Particularism	Universalism*	Universalism*	Universalism
Performance-Quality	Quality	Performance	Performance*	Performance
Diffuseness-Specificity	Diffuseness	Specificity	Specificity*	Specificity
Collectivity-Self	Collectivity	Collectivity	Self*	Collectivity

* Conditional

In all societies the family has expressive functions (pattern maintenance and tension management), and in American society this is the primary function. The family is always an arena in which wishes are gratified. Postponed gratification may occur at periodic intervals or in response to extraordinary environmental conditions. Family members relate to one another on the basis of particularistic criteria. (See the discussion in Parsons, 1950, pp. 153-157.) Strains usually involve the loyalty and obedience of some members to others, not the extent to which they live up to universalistically defined expectations. The commitment of family members to one another is expected to be unconditional: it does not depend upon "satisfactory performances" nor is it inherently limited in scope.

Of course, families in the past have been economic and political groups as well as expressive groups, and even now family members must sometimes work in cooperation to attain goals. This involves postponing gratification, the application of universalistic criteria in the assignment of tasks and the evaluation of performances, the evaluation of participants in terms of "how they perform" rather than "who they are," and limitations on the scope of concern of actors for one another. The performance of instrumental activities generates strains among family members. These strains may be controlled by alternating instrumental and expressive activities in the course of time and by the differentiation of roles within the family. It is also true that the activities are usually perceived as adaptive for the family as a group in the short run. Although universalistic criteria are used in the selection of means to attain a given goal, the selection of the goal involves particularistic criteria. Individual family members undoubtedly learn skills in these family

activities. However, this learning is likely to be "inefficient," since it is not the goal of the activity. Furthermore, in modern times the range of necessary skills that can be acquired in adaptive family activities has become narrower and narrower.

As Table 2 indicates, deliberate instruction is superficially similar to family adaptive activities. Achievement of the goal of learning has primacy over immediate gratification. Teachers and students are expected to limit their reciprocal expectations and obligations to behavior relevant to teaching and learning. In practice, attempts are made to limit the strains produced in young children by this affectively neutral-functionally specific regime. Elementary teachers are usually women who are permitted to act in a somewhat maternal manner. (Parsons, 1950, pp. 240f.) The observations of Jules Henry (1963) suggest that the affectively diffuse behavior of many elementary teachers may extend so far as to place a strain on the relations between teachers and students. But the extent of such behavior is inherently limited by the presence of a single teacher for a class of twenty or more children of similar age who are in direct competition for the teacher's affection. The presence of a class of students of the same age also makes it easier to apply universalistic criteria for performances. (See Aries, 1962, on the historical development of age grading in European education. He shows that the medieval school was definitely not age graded. It is reasonable to suppose that this made it more difficult for teachers to apply universalistic criteria and thereby reduced the "efficiency" of the system. Aries shows that many students repeated the same course several times and often attended schools many years before acquiring elementary skills.) Nuclear families seldom have more than one child in any age group; while

parents may attempt to discover universalistic norms in books like those by Gesell, it is unlikely that they can consistently apply universalistic criteria.

The teacher's relationship to the student is not unconditional but is contingent upon the student's performances. There are some ambiguities here, since success in school may not be taken only as the result of "achievement" but also as the discovery of inherent "qualities." Having a degree, or even being in the "college preparatory track" in a high school, is in one sense an ascribed status. Turner (1960) has suggested that the ascriptive element is more important in English than in American society. Stinchcombe (1965) shows how the imputation of inferior qualities to inferior high school students is an important cause of their rebellion.

The collectivity orientation of the student is also somewhat ambiguous. While family adaptive activities are (usually) clearly instrumental for the goals of the family as a group, the instrumental activities of the student may be more self-oriented - although this rarely seems to be true for elementary and secondary students.

It is clear that, when a parent attempts to instruct a child, he must introduce a different set of value orientations than usually governs the relationship. Teacher and student must accept frustrations and postpone gratifications. (This does not imply that the activity may not be intrinsically gratifying; it does imply that immediate gratification cannot have primacy in the situation.) The parent must evaluate the child's performances, and he must do so using the universalistic criteria relevant to the skill. For the duration of the instruction, both parties must relate to one another in the limited roles of teacher and student.

All of these changes from normal behavior generate strains in the relationship.

Of course, parents frustrate children and evaluate children in the course of normal socialization, especially in the area of "moral instruction." But moral instruction in the family does not involve the postponement of gratification: typically it involves the expression of his feelings by the parent. Moral instruction is typically diffuse and relevant to the particular relation between parent and child. Its positive "outputs" are the expression of love by the parent and the establishment of authority or nurturant relations from the parent to the child. (Moral instruction also has a more generalized aspect, relating to the child's position in some larger collectivity - the larger family, the community, or the status group. But elements of authority and dependency are still involved.) The positive output of technical instruction is different: it is the ability of the child to perform a task <u>independently</u>. While the parent may reward the child with expressions of affection, this is an indirect consequence of the activity; the direct consequence is to reduce the authority-dependency relationship.

Similarly, parents frustrate children and evaluate children according to universalistic criteria in the course of practical activities. In these activities, however, the performances of the child are relevant as means, not ends. It is generally inefficient to assign a task to a child beyond his present capabilities, while this is the rule in instruction. (Of course, sophisticated teachers assign tasks only <u>just</u> beyond present abilities, so that the duration of frustration is short.) In practical activities, the consequence of a child's failure is typically to have the task performed by someone else; it does not signify failure of the entire activity. Just as the goal of the activity is not to change the child's

capabilities, failure to perform has less effect on the child's self concept and status.

A game is a kind of pretended practical activity. Once players sit at a table to play anagrams or monopoly, they are governed in part by values like those of practical activity: they defer immediate gratification to win, they utilize universalistic criteria in selecting moves, they relate to other players in terms of actual or potential performances, and their obligations to other players are strictly limited by the rules of the game. Families often play games, and games may be important for learning. But any consequences of games, outside of "fun," are incidental. (On this and the following, see Goffman, 1961, and the sources cited there.) Games are by definition "non-productive." They are not expected to have consequences outside themselves, and external reality is not expected to influence play. As Goffman puts it, games have (usually implicit) "transformation rules" regarding the relevance and irrelevance of the everyday statuses of participants for the game, and games are protected by an "interaction membrane" which protects them from the outside social reality. Family members can be "impersonal" and "competitive" in games simply because games are denied serious reality. This is probably the reason for the importance of games in familial education. However, games are often inefficient ways of achieving learning, and games that are superior for learning purposes may be difficult to play in families. If players are too unequal in skill, the competitive game breaks down. While parents may sometimes "play to lose" in games, this is a violation of their rules and their spirit; most children see through it fairly quickly.

When the parent attempts to deliberately instruct the child, then, he must basically change his role. Sometimes such changes in roles can

be tolerated, as they are in the game or in practical activity. The role conflicts involved in the parent-teacher, child-student situation are more severe because the situation is treated seriously (as having important consequences) and because it jeopardizes the child's security. This effect can also be viewed in terms of the child's identification and imitation of parents and teachers.

"Imitation is the process by which specific items of culture, specific bits of knowledge, skill, symbolic behavior, are taken over from a social object in the interaction process." (Parsons, 1950, p. 211.) The model specifies a goal and exemplifies the sequence of activities necessary to reach the goal. Imitation does not imply any continuing, or any "sentimental," relation to the model. It is an essential aspect of technical education, and may sometimes be interpersonally sufficient. The following hypothesis may be advanced: if the flow of demand in instruction is from student to teacher, imitation may be sufficient and identification may be unnecessary. An example of such a situation might be an adult male taking a golf lesson from a professional. On the other hand, if the flow of demand in instruction is from the teacher to the student, it cannot be taken for granted that the student will share the goals of the instructor - a sharing necessary for imitation to occur. Then the student must be motivated to adopt the instructor's goals, and this usually involves identification with the instructor. (This is because most learning activities do not quickly enough provide rewards in themselves and because overt coercion interferes with learning.)

Thus, children usually "identify" with both teachers and parents. "Identification . . . means taking over, i.e., internalizing, the values of a model. It implies that ego and alter have established a reciprocal

role relationship in which value-patterns are shared." (Parsons, 1950, p. 211.) The pattern variables provide a simple classification of types of identification (Parsons, 1950, pp. 108ff.):

	Specificity	Diffuseness
affectivity	receptivity-response	"love"
neutrality	approval	esteem

The child typically forms a "love" attachment to his parents, and an "approval" or "esteem" attachment to his teachers. Given identification and the desire by the child to win love, approval, and esteem, the teacher or parent can gain compliance from the child by withholding expressions of these sentiments (or by "manipulating relational rewards," as Parsons felicitously puts it). In this respect the parent is severely handicapped relative to the teacher. Withdrawal of love is more threatening to the child than withdrawing approval or esteem and is likely to produce disruptive anxiety. The teacher role is segmental and limited in duration, and most students can tolerate alienation from teachers. (Frequently they tolerate such alienation only too well.) Thus teachers can meaningfully threaten the child with a termination of the relationship; parents cannot.

The child unwilling to accept instruction, to imitate his model, is usually "in a bind": if he fails to conform to the wishes of the other, he must forego expressions of love, approval, or esteem from the other. The child in such a situation has two solutions to his problem, either to conform or to forego the affectionate response, but he does have solutions. When the parent is the teacher of a complex skill the situation of the child may become more problematical, possibly without solutions: he may be placed in a "double bind." This stems from the fact that

instruction in complex skills usually leads to a kind of independence from the teacher. Thus, the parent as teacher sends inconsistent messages to his child: (1) "Acquire this skill so you may become independent of me." More specifically, "Learn how to drive so I need not drive you around any more," "Learn how to read so I need not read to you," etc. (2) A second message, usually implicit, of the form, "Do not become independent of me: if you attempt to evade *my* authority or care, I will punish *you*." If the child fails to strive toward independence by acquiring the skill, he will be punished; if he becomes more independent by acquiring skills, he will be punished.

This situation is much like the double bind originally described by Bateson and his colleagues in an attempt to explain schizophrenia (Bateson *et al.*, 19[illegible] and 1963). They describe the schizophrenogenic double bind as having the following characteristics: (1) two or more persons; (2) repeated experience; (3) a primary negative injunction of the form, "If you do not do so and so, I will punish you"; (4) a secondary injunction conflicting with the first at a more abstract level and like the first enforced by punishments; (5) injunctions against communicating about the discrepancy (against "metacommunication"); and (6) a negative injunction prohibiting the victim from escaping the field. According to these writers, the victim of a prolonged double bind may resolve his problem by schizophrenic behavior: schizophrenia is a communicative disorder in which the person may not perceive some messages, may take metaphors literally or literal statements metaphorically, or may deny existing relationships.

We need not accept the double bind theory of schizophrenia to appreciate the fact that double bind situations place the victim under

severe strains. A double bind may initially induce the victim to escape the situation; such alienation is perhaps common when a parent attempts to teach a child. Only when no escape is possible is the double bind associated with personality disorders. The double bind does not arise in the normal teacher-pupil relationship, since it is expected that the pupil will become independent of the teacher. The parent, however, will find it difficult not to communicate - by tone of voice, facial expressions, or in other subtle ways - the message that he does not wish his child to become independent of him. The failures of children are used as justifications for continued parental control; if there are no failures they will be created.

(Bateson and his collaborators discuss only what might be called the "authoritarian double bind" - when the victim is formally subordinate to the other. When the victim is in a formally superordinate position there may develop what may be called a "dependency double bind." The child may overtly assert a wish to become independent, but covertly assert his wishes to remain dependent. This is easily accomplished by simple failure. The dependency double bind may also arise in cases of deliberate instruction. However, it is likely to be less serious than the authoritarian double bind, at least in parent-child relations. The parent may easily escape the situation - especially by collaborating with his spouse. Furthermore, the parent finds it easier to send metacommunicative messages. Parents frequently tell their children what the actions of the latter "really mean"; some psychiatrists imply that this is almost always a pathological type of communication, but they are surely mistaken. On the other hand, the dependency double bind in husband-wife relations may be a much more serious problem.)

The double bind does not arise when the parent is the teacher if he clearly indicates that the purpose of the instruction is not to make the child independent of him. He can do this in part by defining the activity as "instrumental": the child is to be taught so that he can continue to cooperate with the parent in an activity of benefit to them both. However, such a strategy may produce a child with an overly dependent personality.

Thus far this theoretical discussion has treated only of parental roles in a general way. However, parental roles are always differentiated. Parsons and his colleagues (see especially Parsons and Bales, 1955, ch. VI) assert that in every society the father plays a primarily instrumental role, acting as an authority figure, while the mother plays a primarily expressive role, acting as a nurturant figure. They argue that this differentiation of roles is functionally necessary: necessary both to maintain the instrumental adequacy and integration of the family as a group and to adequately socialize the children. Without role differentiation children will remain dependent and they will fail to be adequately socialized for adult sex roles. Philip Slater has very effectively argued against this functional theory (Slater, 1961). He shows that the modern American family is relatively "undifferentiated," and he presents a great deal of evidence to show that children in American families are less adequately socialized when parental role differentiation is high than when it is low. He does suggest, however, that high role differentiation may be more functional in some primitive societies.

Regardless of the general functions of parental role differentiation, we may well ask whether it might not be functional for deliberate

instruction in families. The argument presented above was in terms of the incompatibility of the teacher role with the primarily "expressive" role of the parent. If, however, the mother plays a primarily "expressive" role and the father a primarily "instrumental" role, why may not the father be an effective teacher of complex skills? The father's instrumental role may be characterized by neutrality, universalism, performance, and specificity, even in relation to his children, just as the teacher's role. It might be hypothesized, then, that the instrumentally oriented father could teach his children complex skills without generating interpersonal strains. A similar hypothesis, which can be tested readily, is that instruction in American families will be most successful when parental roles are highly differentiated. Preliminary observations, to be discussed below, suggest that these hypotheses are false. There are some theoretical reasons for expecting them to be false.

The differentiation of parental roles in a society is inversely correlated with potential disjunctions in the roles of parents and children. High differentiation occurs when sons succeed to the positions of their fathers, less differentiation when they do not. (This proposition is suggested by the theory of Bott, 1957; see also Slater, 1961.) Thus, when there is high parental role differentiation, the father is likely to be a continuing authority over his sons and a member of the same kinship and political units as they are. Thus, even such "instrumentally" oriented fathers are likely to stand in a particularistic relationship to their sons, to be primarily oriented to the ascribed statuses of their sons, and to be diffusely oriented toward them. Problems of authority and loyalty will be more salient than problems of competence to perform important tasks. In such societies relations between fathers and sons

tend to be highly structured; social distance is high, and patterns of deference are elaborated and formalized. (See Stephens, 1963, ch. 7-8.) Fathers in such societies will be unlikely to give sons the independence required of students. Good descriptions are provided by Oscar Lewis (1962) in his descriptions of Mexican families. It has been shown that paternal autocratic dominance is associated with the dependency of sons in our own and other industrialized societies (Elder, 1965).

In summary, deliberate instruction in societies with high parental role differentiation is likely to produce strains because of the importance of filial obedience and loyalty. Deliberate instruction in societies with low role differentiation is likely to produce strains because of the importance to children of parental nurturance and security.

The preceding discussion has been directed to attempts by parents to teach children, but it can readily be extended to other types of familial instruction. Thus, when a husband attempts to teach his wife, much the same type of role conflict will be produced as when a parent attempts to teach a child. The strains will be exacerbated (in modern American society) by the formal equality of husband and wife. If the flow of demand is from teacher to student, the formal equality of the spouses will be contradicted by the practice of instruction. It is always difficult to express formal equality in a situation where partners are in fact unequal - where the husband has more power than the wife and is treated more deferentially - and the symbolically unequal aspect of instruction can be expected to produce great strains. The same would be true if children attempted to instruct parents. On the other hand, strains relative to power might be relatively unimportant if older siblings instructed younger and clearly inferior ones. If the younger

siblings are, in addition, not dependent emotionally upon the elder, this type of instruction might be conducted with little interpersonal strain.

This theoretical discussion has produced the following hypotheses:

1. Attempts at deliberate instruction in complex skills in family contexts will generate severe interpersonal strains. This is not so with "moral instruction."

a. On the part of the child, this strain will be manifested in feelings of insecurity and anxiety. These will lead the child to attempt to avoid instruction or to engage in "regressive" behavior.

b. On the part of the parent, this strain will be manifested in irritability - aggression against the child. In part this will be caused by the ambivalence of the parent with regard to the independence he is fostering. Parents will tend to confuse the technical failure of children with personal disobedience by them.

2. Deliberate instruction is more likely to be successful when given by the father in families where parental roles are highly differentiated. (This hypothesis was suggested but not strongly supported by theoretical considerations.)

3. The greater the power and formal equality of the student, the greater the strains when instruction is attempted. Thus, strains will be ordered from high to low in the following fashions: child as teacher, parent as student; wife-husband; husband-wife; [illegible]-child; [illegible]-child; older child-younger child.

4. If instruction is attempted and is successful in technical terms, the child is likely to have a prolonged period of dependency upon his parent.

5. Learning complex skills in family contexts will be easier if the flow of demand in instruction is from the student to the teacher.

6. Learning complex skills in family contexts will be more likely to occur as an incidental consequence of practical activities or games than as a consequence of deliberate instruction.

Hypothesis 4 is a kind of functional hypothesis: instruction is not attempted because of its consequences. Hypotheses 1 and 3 are stated in terms of efficient causes. The "theory" used here is obviously inadequate in many respects; the concepts involved in it are not rigorously defined, and the hypotheses do not follow from the theory in a logically rigorous manner. Nevertheless, this type of reasoning does provide a place from which to start. I shall now present evidence, mostly from contemporary sources, which is pertinent to these hypotheses.

ILLUSTRATIVE EVIDENCE FOR HYPOTHESES

In exploratory research it is desirable to seek for the widest possible variety of sources of evidence. It is only justifiable to select a single method or a highly specific type of behavior for study when one has plausible hypotheses, adequate operational definitions of concepts, and well defined populations. I have searched for illustrations of the preceding hypotheses from the following sources: previous studies relating family and school performance; studies of children who learn to read before attending grade one; studies of families in alien environments, where schools are absent or inadequate; biographies of child prodigies taught by parents; and my own interviews concerning instruction in music and driving.

The Family and the School

The family has a great influence on a child's performance in school. Undoubtedly much of the academic superiority of middle class over working

class children (Sewell, Haller, and Strauss, 1957) can be accounted for by differences in family environment. There is no evidence, however, that the family environment of the middle class child includes deliberate instruction from his parents. Rather, the parent helps motivate the child to aspire to achieve (Kahl, 1953), and he supports the authority of the school teacher (Phillips, 1959). The home of the superior learner is more likely to have books and magazines in abundance (Milner, 1951; Cappa and Schubert, 1962).

The parent may deliberately encourage his child to perform well in school even if he does not deliberately instruct him. However, perhaps the most important characteristics of the family environment with regard to school success are non-deliberate - characteristics like the parent's own reading habits, or the quality of the language typically used in the home (Bernstein, 1962). The absence of a father (Carlsmith, 1964), or the emotional warmth of the mother (Bing, 1963), may produce effects on the quality of achievement, such as whether the child is superior in reading or in mathematics.

One of the major areas in which deliberate instruction may occur is with regard to the child's homework from school. Surveys show that parents often report helping their children on homework. In the Oakland Leisure Time Survey, 78 per cent of the fathers of school age children reported helping them on their homework,[6] and Johannis' study of the fathers of Florida tenth graders found 40 per cent reporting such help (reported in Landis, 1965, p. 139). The likelihood of such assistance is correlated with the status of the father. Johannis found that 49 per cent of the middle class fathers but only 35 per cent of the working class fathers reported giving assistance. In the Oakland study, 80 per

cent of the 163 fathers who had graduated from high school, but only 61 per cent of the 70 who had not, gave assistance. Of course, these figures are suspect, for it is easier to say "yes" to an interviewer than to assist a child with his homework. These surveys do not give data on the characteristics of the children involved, but it seems likely that the correlations between these characteristics and whether or not assistance is given are larger than the correlations between fathers' characteristics and reports of assistance. We need more detailed studies of the quality of the assistance given. Pending further studies, it is reasonable to suggest that the flow of demand is from the child to his parent. The child asks for assistance on problems given him by his teacher, and the teacher is the one who evaluates the child's performance.

Although the family influences academic performance, this influence is not likely to be the effect of deliberate instruction by parents. Rather, the important activities are either non-deliberate, deliberate but directed toward the child's motivation, or initiated by the child and terminated by him.

Early Readers

Reading is an ability possessed by almost all parents in our society, and most college educated parents probably have far better pedagogical theories of reading instruction and better textbooks than Greek or Medieval professional teachers. Yet reading is usually learned in elementary school. I have suggested that interpersonal factors account for this. However, a small fraction of children in our society learn to read before attending first grade - perhaps 1 to 4 per cent of all children. A study of this group might indicate conditions under which successful instruction can be given in families.

The best studies of this topic have been conducted by Dolores Durkin and are being continued by her. Her first study was conducted in a California community, probably one of lower than average economic status (Durkin, 1961). All 5,103 beginning first graders in the system were tested for reading ability, the criterion being the ability to identify at least 18 of 37 words presented individually. According to this criterion, 49 students, or about 1 per cent of the population, could read. This group was not of unusually high average intelligence: the IQ range was from 91 to 161, the median being 121. Nor were they especially likely to be from high status families: 55 per cent were from lower status families. Durkin reports that upper status were more likely than lower status parents to show "concern or even guilt feelings" about their children's unusual abilities.

The most important result of Durkin's study, for our purposes, is that this ability to read at an early age was <u>not</u> produced by deliberate instruction.

> Parents sometimes say of their preschool child: 'He learned to read all by himself.' Data on these 49 early readers indicate that none of them learned without some kind of help. Usually help took the form of answering persistent questions about words the children saw in books and newspapers, on signs, labels, and TV programs. For 11 of the children, however, the help came from parents who wanted their child to read. Various factors prompted these 11 parents. Five mothers in the group said their children were so persistently interested in learning to read that they decided to teach them. . . . (Durkin, 1961, pp. 16f.)

Thus, in only six of the 49 cases was deliberate instruction clearly reported. It is interesting to note Durkin's report that "help from older siblings often accounted in part for early reading ability." Forty of the 49 children had at least one older sibling. This is in accord with Hypothesis 3 stated above.

Durkin's second study was conducted in New York City (Durkin, 1963). Of 4465 entering first graders, 180, or 4 per cent, could read according to the criterion used in the California study. (I do not know how Durkin accounts for the difference between her California and New York results.) A paragraph reading test eliminated 23 of the 180, leaving 157, or 3.5 per cent, who could read according to this more restrictive criterion. As in California, the New York early readers were not all of unusually high IQ (median 133, range 82-170), and they came from families with lower average socioeconomic status than a control group of non-early readers. Apparently the New York early readers differed from those in California in having a smaller number of siblings than other children. It is possible, however, that most of them had older siblings; these data are not reported.

Durkin does not report the extent of deliberate instruction for the New York sample. However, she does note that parents of all the early readers read to their children and were more likely than other parents to discuss what they had read and point out words in the reading (usually in response to a question from the child).

A less rigorous study of early reading was performed by Lewis Terman as part of his longitudinal study of genius. Starting with a sample of 661 California children of above 135 IQ (the top 0.4 per cent on IQ of 160,000 California third through eighth graders in 1921-1922),

Terman asked parents questions about the child's age when he learned to read. (Such a criterion is much less satisfactory than that used by Durkin. Many parents are likely to impute reading ability to a child who has learned the alphabet and a few words by rote. Perhaps most entering first graders can accomplish this (Ilg and Ames, 1950).) Terman reports that almost half his sample of gifted children could read before entering first grade; at least 20 per cent before the age of 5; 6 per cent before 4; and 1.6 per cent before 3 (Terman and Oden, 1947, p. 25). Those of exceptionally high IQ could read even earlier, on the average (Terman and Oden, 1947, p. 283). Terman indicates that this early reading was not the effect of deliberate instruction:

> There is no evidence that these abilities and preoccupations were to any considerable degree the result of artificial stimulation or forced culture. Although a majority of the parents had encouraged the child by answering his questions and by showing an interest in the things which concerned him, less than a dozen had carried out any systematic scheme of child training. (Terman and Oden, 1947, pp. 25f.)

In summary, studies of early readers indicate that the skill is seldom acquired as the result of deliberate instruction by parents. More intensive studies should be conducted of that small fraction of the total who are successfully taught within their families. The one study I have discovered is rather unsatisfactory. William Fowler, a psychologist, taught his 2-year-old daughter to read and reported his techniques and her technical performances in great detail (1962). Unfortunately, his report contains essentially nothing about interpersonal relations between father and daughter or in the larger family. He reports stressing play

techniques and using short periods of instruction. For 7½ months these procedures were quite successful and the 2-year-old learned to read quite well. However, Fowler reports, in the last 1½ months of the activity (which lasted but 9 months), he encountered "much resistance" from the child; she withdrew from others in her nursery school and exhibited over-dependent behavior. The experiment was then abandoned, and for the following 2½ years she showed little advance in reading ability. She then showed a rapid advance which her father felt would slow down upon her entry into kindergarten. Fowler does report what we are led to expect: resistance by the student-daughter and expressions of over-dependent behavior. It is to be regretted that he did not report these interpersonal and personality reactions in greater detail.

Alien Environments

In a world with much mobility between nations, families will often find themselves without schools but with children of school age. This may happen to immigrant or minority ethnic group families who wish to make their children literate in the language of their forebears; to temporary foreign visitors; and to persons placed in very primitive environments for any other reason. In such situations parents will be under strong inducements to train their children themselves.

Since I have not systematically searched for data about families in alien environments, I can only speculate about them on the basis of casual observations. The first impression one receives is that families will go to extreme efforts to provide schools for their children. If a community has only twenty or thirty orthodox Jewish or Chinese families, they are very likely to attempt to appoint a teacher for the purpose of instruction in Hebrew or Chinese. American travellers abroad show very

strong preferences for communities with English language schools. When schools are not present, education may be carried on through correspondence courses. The correspondence course may make it possible to structure the situation so that the flow of demand is from the child to the parent. The parent's major demands are likely to involve the scheduling of instructions; this may be a source of strain. The more specific instructional demands on the child come from the correspondence course itself, and the child may then transfer questions to his parent. Similarly, the correspondence school is primarily responsible for evaluating performance. Thus, although the parent is involved in instruction, he may still relate to his child in a particularistic and affectively diffuse fashion. This may reduce the strain to a level where the instruction may be continued, but it would be valuable to study the achievements and personalities of children who experienced prolonged training of this sort to determine if there were tendencies toward prolonged dependency on parents.

Children with physical handicaps are also likely to be in an environment in which schools are inadequate for their needs - an alien environment. Enlisting their parents as teachers may often seem necessary. Sommers (1962) reported a study of the effectiveness of mothers trained to assist in speech correction ("articulation problems"). Mothers of children with speech problems were trained 45 minutes per day for four weeks. Through lectures, discussion, and observation, "Specific games and exercises were stressed, depending on the type of misarticulation of children." Sommers' experiment showed that children of the trained mothers improved significantly more than children of untrained mothers in their articulation; the differences were larger for the high IQ children and for children who were also given individual therapy. Evidently much of the instruction

was directed at improving the mothers' "auditory discrimination abilities"; as this improved, their children's speech improved. This situation is somewhat like correspondence instruction, in that the parent acts as an assistant to the teacher. The mother's "instruction" of her child also took the form of games, in part, and much of the remainder must have been in the form of correcting the child in the course of ordinary activities - not systematic and deliberate instruction.

(Other studies of education for child-rearing have not shown that parents can be trained to successfully teach their own children in a deliberate fashion. See the review of the literature in Brim (1959).)

More studies will be conducted of families with handicapped children and of families in alien environments; such studies should collect data about factors associated with attempts at instruction in complex skills in family units.

Some Successful Cases

Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, John Stuart Mill, Norbert Wiener (the mathematician), and Ruth Slenczynska (the pianist), were successfully instructed by their fathers in complex skills - if any conventional meaning is attached to "success." The autobiographies of the last three shed much light on the interpersonal dynamics involved. Although the three cases are different in many respects, and although their complexity defies brief analysis, a number of themes are common to them. Four themes of special interest here are the following: (1) Parental roles in child rearing were not differentiated between an instrumentally oriented father and a warmly expressive mother. Rather, the father totally dominated the prodigy, and the mother was a rather distant figure; some hostility was directed against the mother because of her inability to

protect the child against his father's punishment. (2) Instruction provoked anxiety in the children and occasional anger in the father. Only the possibility of being totally rejected by the father induced the child to continue the relationship. (3) Parents "protected" their children from the publicity of the prodigy by asserting that they were not unusually bright and that any child could perform as well given the same superior instruction. (4) Between the ages of 15 and 25 the child experienced a dependency crisis in which he rejected his father as an absolute authority. Afterward the child may have expressed more independence, but he was always extremely ambivalent toward his father-teacher. I shall briefly summarize the three autobiographies to illustrate these themes.

Ruth Slenczynski (substituting an "a" for the terminal "i" was her later symbolic expression of rebellion) was born in 1925 to a Polish immigrant father who taught the violin. Her instruction in the piano began at age three. In the following year she rejected instruction in the violin preferred by her father; he was greatly offended but became determined to make her into a great pianist. For the following 15 years he compelled her to engage in gruelling practice; most of her waking hours were spent with the piano. Her father scheduled her practice, programmed her activities, and corrected her mistakes; he was often angry, denying her small gratifications and beating her. She was the student of such great pianists as Cortot, Schnabel, and Rachmaninoff, but it is fair to say that her father continued to play a dominant role in her instruction. Her autobiography, from which this description is taken, is entitled Forbidden Childhood (Slenczynska and Biancolli, 1957) and is almost a litany of hatred against her father; at the same time, strong elements of love remained throughout.

Her mother had little to do with caring for her or instructing her. On two occasions her mother asked her to leave her father; Ruth refused, allegedly because she did not want to leave playing the piano, but probably because of her dependence upon her father as well.

Ruth was an international concert star by age eight. Around age 13 or 14 she lost faith in the musical ability of her father. At age 15 she played a series of concerts which were very poorly received. At this time she broke with her father. (She reports this as a matter of mutual rejection.) She continued to live with her family but was evidently somewhat disorganized. Within a year or two she married and left her family; her father's last words to her were "You lousy little bitch! You'll never play two notes again without me!" (p. 232) She evidently almost believed this, for throughout her childhood her father had denigrated her abilities and attributed her success to his instruction. It was almost a decade before she resumed her concert career. When she did so, she asked her audience for permission to play as an encore "an additional number by Bach in memory of my late father." (p. 244)

Norbert Wiener's father was far less exploitative. While Ruth Slenczynska was effectively isolated even from intimate contact with her sisters, Norbert had what he perceived to be an almost normal relation with his age peers. Nevertheless, his father (a philologist) dominated his life until he was at least 16. His mother was ineffectual in her attempts to protect him. His description of an instructional session in mathematics from the first volume of his autobiography (Wiener, 1953) depicts the strains:

> He would begin the discussion in an easy, conversational tone. This lasted exactly until I made the first mathematical

> mistake. Then the gentle and loving father was replaced by the avenger of the blood. The first warning he gave me of my unconscious delinquency was a very sharp and aspirated "What!" and if I did not follow this by coming to heel at once, he would admonish me, "How do this again!" By this time I was weeping and terrified. Almost inevitably I persisted in sin, or what was worse, corrected an admissible statement into a blunder. Then the last shreds of my father's temper were torn. . . . The schoolmaster everywhere can summon to his aid the absurdity of his pupil. The very tone of my father's voice was calculated to bring me to a high pitch of emotion, and when this was combined with irony and sarcasm, it became a knout with many lashes. My lessons often ended in a family scene. Father was raging, I was weeping, and my mother did her best to defend me, although hers was a losing battle. (pp. 67f.)

His parents sent him to school in third grade, but this proved unsuccessful. After a year his father recommenced being his sole tutor, and this continued until Norbert was 10. He graduated from a high school at 12 and received his bachelor's degree at 15.

Norbert's father occasionally granted interviews to newspapermen in which he emphasized that Norbert was "essentially an average boy who had had the advantage of superlative training." (p. 119) To some extent both Norbert and his father really believed this; Norbert wrote, "My experience leads me to believe that the prodigy is desperately unsure of himself and underrates himself." (p. 117) He first left home to study philosophy at Cornell when he was 16. His year there was quite

unproductive and constitutes the dependency crisis in his career. Only when he went to Cambridge (England) at the age of 19 did he really feel liberated from his father - and even later his courtship was seriously jeopardized by his dependence on his father.

Wiener's descriptions of other prodigies he encountered during his Harvard career are worth noting (pp. 135-136). Two of them, Roger Sessions and Cedric Boughton, were not instructed closely by their parents and apparently encountered no unusual personality problems. A. A. Berle had been instructed by his father, but no serious problems were evident. W. J. Sidis, on the other hand, became a complete failure. His rebellion against his father was so intense that he also rebelled against all intellectual work; in later life he held menial jobs.

John Stuart Mill never attended a school or university and was solely instructed by his father, James Mill, at least until the age of 14. His autobiography (1924) is not so candid an expression of feeling as the autobiographies of Sienkiewicz or Wiener, but the early draft (Stillinger, 1961) is a partial compensation. His father dominated his education, his mother ineffectually attempted to protect him, and his feelings toward each of them contained elements of hostility. For example, referring to his father, he wrote:

> In an atmosphere of tenderness and affection he would have been tender and affectionate; but his ill assorted marriage and his asperities of temper disabled him from making such an atmosphere. It was one of the most unfavourable of the moral agencies which acted on me in my boyhood, that mine was not an education of love but of fear. (Stillinger, 1961, p. 66)

John asserted that his father effectively protected him against "self-

concepts so effectively that John could actually write of himself that he was "below rather than above par" in intellectual abilities.

At the age of 14 John left England for more than a year to stay with family friends in France. He dated the termination of his father's systematic instruction from this time. At about the age of 20 he experienced a profound mental depression lasting, with intervals, for three years. At this time he came to question seriously his father's philosophical opinions. His dependent needs were not met.

> My father, to whom it would have been natural to me to have recourse in any practical difficulties, was the last person to whom, in such a case as this, I looked for help. Everything convinced me that he had no knowledge of any such mental state as I was suffering from, and that even if he could be made to understand it, he was not the physician who could heal it. . . . Of other friends, I had at that time none to whom I had any hope of making my condition intelligible. (Mill, 1924, p. 93)

At the age of 25 he formed a rather dependent relationship with Mrs. Harriet Taylor, who became his wife 20 years later. Stillinger refers to his "fantastic dependence upon Harriet's judgment and approval in practical matters. He was virtually helpless in household affairs. . . ." (Stillinger, 1961, p. 25) - an incapacity of which he was aware and for which he blamed his education.

Both Mill and Wiener were given responsibility for instructing their younger siblings, and neither liked it, nor did they believe that it especially benefited their siblings.

Cases such as those of Simonyenka, Wiener, and Mill demonstrate

that fathers can successfully instruct their children in complex skills - if "successful" is taken to mean "technically successful." However, the success was accompanied by the strains and other consequences theoretical reasoning leads us to expect. There were strains in the relationship, manifested in aggression by the parent-teacher, anxiety by the child-student, and a strong element of hostility in the sentiment of the child to his father. The instruction could continue only because of the domination of the child by the father-teacher. From this relationship the mother was more or less excluded. It is reasonable to believe that a stronger relationship between child and mother would have made the instruction impossible; a strong and loving mother could have protected her child by acting in such a way as to terminate paternal tyrannical behavior, and the termination of this behavior would probably have led to the termination of the instruction. These three prodigies exhibited a prolonged dependency, a dependency associated with a serious career crisis as they neared maturity. Of course, such crises occur in the lives of many children; only systematic research can demonstrate the specific effects of parental instruction.

Our information about the life of a fourth prodigy, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, is much less complete, but he should nevertheless be mentioned as an exception to the preceding generalizations. Leopold Mozart was the male and almost the only instructor of his son (and daughter) in music. He supervised his son's career until Wolfgang was at least 21, and the rich correspondence they left (Blumenfeld, 1962) shows that he attempted to continue this control by letter even after his son had left his home. Yet Wolfgang's letters reveal no hostility toward his father, he never openly broke with him, and there was never in his career a personality crisis during which he could not produce music.

Wolfgang was more closely identified with his father than the other prodigies I have described: he pursued exactly the same profession, and he was the family breadwinner in his father's later years. Yet Leopold asked to be surpassed, and Wolfgang evidently did surpass him with relatively little interpersonal strain. The only evidence of strain is what we can gain by a kind of psychoanalytic interpretation of his major operas. (See Brophy, 1964.) More than other composers, Mozart played an important part in choosing subjects for operas and preparing libretti. Themes of father-son rivalry are clearly present in The Abduction from the Seraglio, The Marriage of Figaro, Don Giovanni, and The Magic Flute. Brophy aptly characterizes "Figaro" as an opera of the Enlightenment in which a paternalistic traditional figure is defeated, and defeated in an erotic encounter. Don Giovanni was written later, shortly after the death of Leopold Mozart. It is an anti-Enlightenment opera, an opera in which an erotically defiant son is punished. Brophy suggests that it was for Mozart what Hamlet was for William Shakespeare. The Magic Flute, written near the end of his life, represents a kind of reconciliation of father and son. Thus, perhaps Mozart expressed the strains of his unusual father-son relationship in a sublimated form. But it is difficult to take such reasoning seriously from a scientific point of view, and, in any case, Mozart represents a clear exception to the reasoning presented here.

Music Teachers

I interviewed a half dozen professional music instructors who were also parents of children at least old enough to receive musical instruction. In the early interviews I attempted to get references to "successful" parental teachers. My informants could name but very few such parents (only one in Madison, Wisconsin) among all their acquaintances.

Some of the failures are not especially interesting here. These may be called "failures of identification." It was clear from what the fathers said that their children were alienated from them in some critical ways: the children did not aspire to be "like" their fathers - neither musicians nor intellectuals. When such alienation is present, instruction in such complex skills as music cannot be successful. The child can thwart his father simply by performing poorly. (Ruth Slenczynska reported that her two younger sisters avoided her fate by being unable to perform. Her father quickly gave up on them.)

One informant was a professional instructor of a wind instrument. He was "successful" in teaching his eldest son to play the instrument for three or four years. The son had earlier received piano instructions from a non-family member. When his son was in third grade, this man simply placed him into his regular schedule of teaching appointments. He found it unsatisfying. While he did not report being aggressive himself, he did note that his son would sometimes get tears in his eyes after being corrected on musical errors. When the family moved to a different city, he arranged for his son to receive lessons from someone else. His younger children do not play his instrument and have therefore not received instruction from him - although he does correct them if he "hears them playing wrong." His interpretation of the situation was similar to that given here: parents are typically disciplinarians. Instructions and corrections in music lessons are likely to be confused, by both parent-teacher and child-student, with "disciplinary" instructions and corrections. This confusion naturally does not arise with a professional instructor and his non-related students.

The daughter of the most successful parent-instructor had won a valuable music scholarship and played his woodwind instrument in the

student symphony orchestra. His success can probably be attributed to his daughter's innate talent, to her positive identification with him, and also in part to the techniques he was able to use. He never succeeded in arranging "formal" instruction. He had discussed with her the possibility of including her in his regular schedule of appointments, but somehow this had never been accomplished. Nor did he closely monitor her performance. She apparently acquired the "basic concepts" early in life with "no deliberate effort on anyone's part." She received extra-familial instruction in the piano in fifth grade and shortly after started playing one of his instruments. He would answer her questions about it and, "being in the same house when she practiced," would shout corrections to her when she made mistakes. Clearly, in this case, the flow of demand in instruction was largely from student to teacher.

This man revealed three problem areas in music instruction. First is the problem of "driving" the student to practice. He did not wish to drive his daughter and therefore did not schedule lessons for her. He thought it easier to teach non-kin: "They can be driven." The music instructor can threaten an unrelated student with a discontinuation of their relationship if the student does not practice. This sanction, like mild expressions of disappointment or angry harangues, will not seriously disturb the student but may motivate him to work. Such sanctions, especially the threat to terminate the relationship, cannot so easily be used with kin.

The second problem area in instruction concerns the student's identification of his own mistakes. He must learn he has made a mistake by hearing it. This conceptual aspect must be taught, probably by having errors pointed out by the instructor. In this stage of instruction the

flow of demand is from the teacher to the student, and strains are probably especially intense.

The third problem area concerns the correction of mistakes, once noted. If the student can detect his own errors he can approach the instructor for advice on how to correct them. Then the flow of demand is from the student to the instructor, and strains are much reduced. This successful pupil probably reached this stage quickly.

While my informant successfully "instructed" his daughter, he would not think of attempting to instruct his wife, who does not perform - because, in his words, "Performing is not always fun." In any case, the relatively informal technique he used seemed to be more successful than the more "formal" approach of segregating the teacher-student relationship from other aspects of the parent-child relationship. One informant had just started teaching his young daughter piano; this was to occur on a fixed hour every week, and during the course of the instruction she was to address him as "Mr. M-," not "Daddy." It seems likely, on the basis of the experience of others, that this approach will be unsuccessful.

Driving Instruction

Over the last few years I have asked many friends and acquaintances about their experiences when one spouse attempted to teach the other how to drive an automobile. Out of the 50 to 100 couples I have investigated, the vast majority reported that the husband's attempt to teach his wife this skill resulted in great strains. In over a tenth of the cases the attempt resulted in failure: either the wife didn't learn, or she learned at a school. There were often reports of the wife bursting into tears, or "It was the first time in our marriage that he shouted angrily at me." Only one husband did not report strain when he taught his wife.

The only wife to teach her husband reported little interpersonal strain (she was anxious, but she kept it to herself).

Recently I have asked younger unmarried persons similar questions, and I have had students in a sociological research methods course ask questions about driving instruction to an accidental sample of their University of Wisconsin peers. These reports indicate much less strain when a parent teaches a child how to drive. The most important variable appears to be the sex of the student: girls were much more likely to report high strain than boys. Although the sample of students leaves much to be desired, and although the skill and honesty of involuntary student interviewers also leaves much to be desired, I have classified and tabulated the results of these interviews to give a suggestive, if crude, picture of the relative strains. The data are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. RELATIVE STRAIN IN DRIVING INSTRUCTION BY SEX AND RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENT AND TEACHER

Relative Strain	Husband Teaches Wife	Parent Teaches Son	Parent Teaches Daughter
Failure of instruction	over 10%	0%	24%
Reported high strain (but successful)	over 80	12	17
Moderate strain	-	20	6
Low or no strain	under 10	68	53
Total	100	100	100
(Number of cases)	(50 to 100)	(25)	(53)

The first thing to note is that driving instruction is usually successful. Family members can usually teach one another skills like driving. (The failure rate would be lower if schools for driving were not available as an alternative.) Furthermore, in a majority of cases

students reported little or no strain in the instruction given them by their parents. (Even when high strain was reported, there was no evidence that the interpersonal relationship was permanently altered as a result.) Family members find it easier to teach one another driving than to teach them music, reading, or other academic skills. This is undoubtedly the result of the fact that driving ability is more easily acquired. The relationship can readily stand the strain of a few weeks of driving instruction, while instruction in music or reading must be continued for years. Driving instruction pays off quickly for the student, while it takes longer for the student to appreciate the benefits of instruction in other skills.

The data in Table 3 support the hypothesis that strains increase with the power and formal equality of the student. The greatest strains are reported when husbands teach wives, the strains are less when parents teach daughters, and they are least when parents teach sons. When a parent teaches a son, it is usually the father; only one case was reported of a mother teaching a son to drive. On the other hand, 20 per cent of the daughters reported being taught by their mothers. The failure rate was much higher for these 14 girls: half of them failed to learn from their mothers, while only 15 per cent of the girls instructed by their fathers failed to learn from them. This also is in accord with the hypothesis about the effects of power and formal equality.

Driving an automobile is basically an easy task, even if driving well is not so easy. Strains arise in instruction not so much because of the task as because of the complex expressive aspects of the situation. The American idiom, "to be in the driver's seat," expresses it quite well. The driver is in the position of symbolic authority, he determines where his passengers will go. The American husband is expected to be "in the

driver's seat"; in most American families the husband drives the car on family occasions, thereby expressing his authority (even if his wife is actually the more powerful person in family decision-making). Thus, teaching another how to drive is teaching him to be independent in a very important expressive fashion. The teacher in such a situation is likely to feel quite ambivalent; the ambivalence will be most intense if his student is (at least expressively) dependent - if the student is a wife or daughter. The student is also likely to feel ambivalent at the expressive aspects of being in the driver's seat. The student's ambivalence will increase with his or her actual emotional dependency.

The driving lesson readily permits this ambivalence to be expressed. It may be physically dangerous, and the instructor has a "right" to be emotionally distraught by the errors of his student. The anxiety of the student easily leads him to make errors. These errors may be caused by the instructor, who wishes (unconsciously?) his student to fail - or they may be produced by the student who does not wish to abandon a dependent position.

The interview materials naturally do not contain data that illustrate these propositions about unconscious wishes. Many students, however, reported much less strain from one instructor than from another. The reasons given for preferring a "professional" driving instructor were interpersonal, not the superior skill of the professional. (Most students who said anything about school courses in driving tended to deride ~~its~~ *their* "Mickey Mouse" aspects.) Similarly, some students reported that the same instructor would experience less strain in teaching some students than others; a father might easily teach his son, for example, but find it much more difficult to teach his daughter or wife.

The critical variables are the instructor's readiness to interpret technical errors as "disobedience," the student's readiness to interpret emotionally charged instructions as "rejection," and the instructor's public descriptions of the student's errors which led to a loss of prestige in a larger context. The first two are illustrated by a typical quotation from a female respondent; she said her father became excited if, after about three tries, she failed in parallel parking:

> He just couldn't understand why it was so hard for me to do, and he'd explain again, and I wouldn't be able to back in right, and he'd get mad and start yelling; and then I'd get upset and we'd quit for the day. . . .

The element of public derision has not been noted previously. Here the instructor maintains the inferior prestige of his student in the family group by ridiculing him for his mistakes. One woman had been taught how to ride a bicycle by her husband. In the course of this instruction she had once been unable to stop and had gone some distance before falling; her husband told this story repeatedly in public for years. She gave this as the reason for not having him as her instructor in driving. A girl said, about her brother's instruction, "He just called me stupid. Everybody's inferior to him. He laughed too, but he was more tolerant." (She preferred her brother as an instructor to her father.) This public derision is also complained of in the autobiographies of Norbert Wiener and Ruth Slenczynska.

Driving instruction enables us to see the strains produced by teaching in family contexts in a kind of microscopic detail. Simply because it is such a minor activity, however, the instruction is often successful, and the strains probably do not produce lasting effects on interpersonal relationships.

Summary

The evidence presented from a variety of sources illustrates the plausibility of all but one of the hypotheses suggested. Deliberate instruction in complex skills in family contexts produces serious interpersonal strains - aggression from the instructor and anxiety from the student. These strains are greater if the instruction is prolonged and if the student is almost a social equal of the instructor. The strains need not lead to lack of success in instruction if the instruction is short, or if the flow of demand is largely from student to instructor, or if the instructor totally dominates the student. Total domination, however, is associated with overdependent behavior on the part of the student. Learning can occur in family contexts more readily if it is an incidental aspect of games or practical activities.

Notes to Analysis and Conclusions

1. See also Stephens (1963), ch. 8; B. Whiting (1963); and Herzog (1962), pp. 301-307.

2. Some doubts may be expressed about the effectiveness of primitive education. Writing about the Alorese of Indonesia, Cora DuBois noted a "general underdevelopment of mastery techniques. It is patent that in practically all specialties there is a singular slovenliness of achievement. . . . Their mythology is confused and unstructuralized. Their knowledge of genealogies is . . . deficient. . . . little is done by way of elaboration, and no effort is made to master the resources of the environment. . . . Consistent training and the assurance of reward (or penalty) are essential to learning. These two factors are largely absent." DuBois gave a psychological explanation of this lack of achievement motivation. (DuBois, 1961, pp. 134f.)

3. On this controversy, see J. Whiting et al. (1958); Young (1962); and Cohen (1964).

4. Marrou (1964, p. 314) asserts that later, in Rome, "The father was looked upon as the child's real teacher, and even later on, when there were proper teachers, they were still supposed to behave more or less like fathers." Further investigations should be made to determine the extent to which fathers actually did give instruction in complex skills, as opposed to moral instruction.

5. All the pattern alternatives exist for each one of these activities. This classification refers to the alternatives which are of primary importance. For a discussion of how pattern alternatives are involved in the socialization process in the family, see Parsons and Bales (1955).

6. Secondary analysis of data collected for the Oakland Leisure Time Study. On the design of the study and the major results, see London et al. (1963).

IV. IMPLICATIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

Studying parents who act as teachers can help us understand what it means to be a parent and what it means to be a teacher. The nature of the relationship places limits on the ways a parent can help his child; in most relationships, a limit is approached when the parent attempts prolonged instruction in some complex skill. Similarly, although a teacher may wish to develop personal and intimate relations with students, and although he may feel that this facilitates learning, there are always limits on the extent to which he can go and still retain his teaching effectiveness. (Cf. Waller, 1932, ch. 17, passim.)

Research on relations between parents and children has often focussed on sentiments and attitudes. While this has been fruitful, it has the limitations of all non-behavioral research. Studies of behavior have focussed on patterns of nurturance (mostly for young children) and patterns of authority. "Everyday" behavior has usually been studied. The research reported here suggests, however, that unusual forms of behavior, such as instruction, may reveal aspects of the relationship other approaches miss. The productive aspects of play and games have been extensively studied, but further research should be done on games involving members of the same family.

Studying differences between parents and teachers may prove revealing for the general topic of interpersonal factors in education. Evidently teachers of complex skills must relate to children in a much more impersonal manner than parents. In fact, it is this interpersonal aspect which defines the role of the teacher, at least the teacher of elementary subjects, and not the teacher's technical knowledge or professional expertise. The teachers in the schools of ancient Greece and Rome or of medieval Europe were woefully inadequate by present day standards, yet they were effective in contrast to parents. Similarly, many of my informants had little respect for the "technical" expertise of driving instructors in the schools today; they learned from these instructors because they could not learn from their parents, even if their parents were expert professional drivers. Yet children identify with teachers, and such identification may be necessary for success in certain types of education. This research has suggested several factors of importance in the teacher-student relationship; these include the presence or absence of a class of age peers, the relative power and prestige of student and

teacher, and the flow of demand in instruction. It is not clear how these factors interact or how they differ in importance for various aspects of student behavior. We need studies of the interpersonal aspects of tutoring, apprenticeship (both historical and contemporary), and of certain types of adult education.

Future studies of familial instruction in complex skills may select among a wide variety of skills. Reading and writing are of great importance, but since they are seldom taught in the family it will be difficult to get large enough samples. I was unable to get access to a population of elementary school teachers who were also parents of school age children; possibly attempts at instruction in reading and other school skills are more common in such families, although I doubt it. (One student informant said she much preferred to be instructed in driving and other skills by her father than by her schoolteacher mother; her mother became impatient and irritable much more quickly than her father.)

Driving is more frequently taught in families, and the variation in strains which result is high and makes driving a nice dependent variable. However, since the duration of driving instruction is short, lasting interpersonal effects are unlikely to be produced. This probably means that people will not accurately recall the interpersonal aspects of their driving instruction. (One of my students suggested that women might recall it better than men and that this might have produced some of the effects reported above.) More importantly, it would not be useful to study driving instruction in order to determine the consequences of instruction for the dependency of the student.

I have not studied familial instruction in athletics, hunting and fishing, and other outdoor sports, although such instruction is common. Many prominent athletes have been as intensively coached by their parents

in their sports as Mozart or Ruth Slenczynska were by their parents in music. However, for a larger population athletics and other outdoor activities are (strangely enough) treated as games - without important consequences - even if parents instruct children. This introduces complications, although the hazy borderline between game and non-game would be interesting to study in its own right.

Parents do teach children other skills even simpler than driving and swimming - skills such as cooking, sewing, house cleaning, and yard care. It would probably not be valuable to study this from the point of view of "instruction." The activities are so closely linked to daily practical activities that they are seldom clear examples of deliberate instruction.

Music instruction may be more amenable to study than instruction in other skills. In music, "instruction" is more readily defined as such than instruction in games or reading instruction. Performing on a musical instrument is a more complex skill than driving and takes longer to learn; the interpersonal aspects of instruction are correspondingly more important. Music teachers are often tempted to instruct their own children because alternative sources of instruction - public schools or private lessons - may be perceived as inadequate or inordinately expensive. In states like Wisconsin, professional music teachers are well organized and could be sampled easily.

I have mentioned several different types of research which could be used to test the hypotheses developed in this exploratory study. If the hypotheses are correct, they will have some implications for parents and educators.

First, instruction in complex skills can be conducted in families if the instruction can be of short duration and if it quickly benefits

the student. Instruction for longer periods, or instruction of less obvious utility, should be approached with caution by parents.

Second, if the parent can be made an "agent" of the teacher, he may be able to assist in the education of his child. This requires that the parent not be involved in evaluating the technical performance of the child and that the flow of demand in instruction be from the child to the parent whenever possible. These arrangements are difficult to arrange in most school systems, partly because parents and teachers are "natural enemies" (Waller, 1932, ch. 6). They may be more easily arranged in the instruction of "exceptional" children.

Third, more attention should be devoted to research on the construction of educational games, since education can occur without interpersonal strains in the context of games. Much attention is devoted to the construction of games, but it is still an "art." Systematic attention is perhaps more likely to be devoted to the cognitive aspects of games than to their interpersonal aspects. However, family games of educational value should be games in which all participants can become "spontaneously involved," and attention to their interpersonal aspects is as important as attention to their cognitive aspects.

Fourth, teachers should be made aware of the dangers involved in becoming personally intimate with their students. Actually, there is probably little reason to be concerned with the over-involvement of teachers in the typical age-graded classroom. The problem may become more serious in schools which attempt to modify this traditional form of organization.

Tristram Shandy, the eighteenth century child whose career was reported in great detail by the novelist Laurence Stern, was unlucky in

many respects but was probably fortunate in his education in the family:

> The first thing which entered my father's head . . . was to sit down coolly, after the example of Xenophon, and write a Tristra-paedia, or system of education for me. . . . In about three years, or something more, my father had got advanced almost into the middle of his work. . . . The misfortune was, that I was all that time totally neglected and abandoned to my mother; and what was almost as bad, by the very delay, the first part of the work, upon which my father had spent the most of his pains, was rendered entirely useless,---every day a page or two became of no consequence.---

V. REFERENCES

ARIES, PHILIPPE. Centuries of Childhood. New York: Knopf, 1962.

BAILYN, BERNARD. Education in the Forming of American Society. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.

BATESON, G., JACKSON, D. D., HALEY, J., AND WEAKLAND, J. Toward a theory of schizophrenia. Behavioral Science, 1956, 1, 251-264.

BATESON, G., JACKSON, D. D., HALEY, J., AND WEAKLAND, J. H. A note on the double bind - 1962. Family Process, 1963, 2, 154-161.

BERNSTEIN, BASIL. Social class and linguistic development. In A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson (Eds.), Education, Economy, and Society. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962. Pp. 288-314.

BIANCOLLI, LOUIS (Ed.). The Mozart Handbook. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1962.

BING, ELIZABETH. Effect of childrearing practices on development of differential cognitive abilities. Child Development, 1963, 34, 631-648.

BOTT, ELIZABETH. Family and Social Network. London: Tavistock, 1957.

BRIM, ORVILLE G., JR. Education for Child Rearing. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1959.

BROPHY, BRIGID. Mozart the Dramatist. London: Faber & Faber, 1964.

BROUDY, HARRY S. Historic exemplars of teaching method. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963. Pp. 44-93.

CAPPA, D., AND SCHUBERT, D. G. Do parents help gifted children to read? Journal of Educational Research, 1962, 56, 33-36.

CARLSMITH, LYN. Effect of early father absence on scholastic aptitude. Harvard Educational Review, 1964, 34, 3-21.

COHEN, Y. A. The establishment of identity in a social nexus. American Anthropologist, 1964, 66, 529-553.

DUBOIS, CORA. The People of Alor, vol. I. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961.

DURKIN, DOLORES. Children who learned to read at home. Elementary School Journal, 1961, 62, 15-18.

DURKIN, DOLORES. Children who learn to read before grade one: a second study. Elementary School Journal, 1963, 64, 143-148.

ELDER, GLEN H., JR. Family structure and educational attainment: a cross-national analysis. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 81-96.

FIRTH, RAYMOND. We, The Tikopia. Boston: Beacon Press, 1957.

FISCHER, JOHN L. The Japanese schools for the natives of Truk, Caroline Islands. In Spindler (1963). Pp. 512-529.

FOWLER, WILLIAM. Teaching a two-year-old to read: an experiment in early childhood learning. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1962, 66, 181-284.

GOFFMAN, ERVING. Encounters. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961.

HENRY, JULES. Spontaneity, initiative, and creativity in suburban classrooms. In Spindler (1963). Pp. 215-233.

HERZOG, JOHN D. Deliberate instruction and household structure: a cross-cultural study. Harvard Educational Review, 1962, 32, 303-342.

HOMANS, GEORGE C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1950.

ILG, F., AND AMES, L. B. Developmental trends in reading behavior. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1950, 76, 291-312.

KAHL, JOSEPH A. Educational and occupational aspirations of 'common man' boys. Harvard Educational Review, 1953, 23, 186-203.

LANDIS, PAUL H. Making the Most of Marriage. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

LEVI-STRAUSS, CLAUDE. Tristes Tropiques. New York: Atheneum, 1964.

LEWIS, OSCAR. Five Families. New York: Science Editions, 1962.

LONDON, JACK, WENKERT, ROBERT, AND HAGSTROM, WARREN O. Adult Education and Social Class. Berkeley: University of California Survey Research Center, 1963.

MARROU, H. I. A History of Education in Antiquity. New York: Mentor, 1964.

MEAD, MARGARET. Our educational emphases in primitive perspective. American Journal of Sociology, 1943, 48, 633-639.

METRAUX, RHODA. Implicit and explicit values in education and teaching as related to growth and development. In Spindler (1963). Pp. 121-131.

MILL, JOHN STUART. Autobiography. New York: Columbia University Press, 1924.

MILNER, ESTHER. A study of the relationship between reading readiness in grade one school children and patterns of parent-child interaction. Child Development, 1951, 22, 95-112.

MURDOCK, GEORGE P. World ethnographic sample. American Anthropolcgist, 1957, 59, 664-687.

PARSONS, TALCOTT. The Social System. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1950.

PARSONS, TALCOTT, AND SHILS, E. A. (Eds.) Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

PARSONS, TALCOTT, AND BALES, ROBERT F. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.

PARSONS, TALCOTT. The school class as a social system: some of its functions in American Society. Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29, 297-318.

PHILLIPS, WALTER. The influence of social class on education: some institutional imperatives. Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 1959, 5, 63-91.

SEWELL, W. H., HALLER, A. O., AND STRAUS, M. A. Social status and educational and occupational aspiration. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 67-72.

SLATER, PHILIP E. Parental role differentiation. American Journal of Sociology, 1961, 67, 296-308.

SLENCZYNSKA, RUTH, AND BIANCOLLI, LOUIS. Forbidden Childhood. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1957.

SMILANSKY, MOSHE, AND ADAR, LEAH (Eds.). Evaluating Educational Achievements: Summaries of Some Studies Carried out by the Henrietta Szold Institute of Schooling in Israel. Paris: UNESCO Educational Studies and Documents, 1961.

SOMMERS, RONALD K. Factors in the effectiveness of mothers trained to aid in speech correction. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 1962, 27, 178-186.

SPINDLER, GEORGE D. (Ed.). Education and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

STEPHENS, WILLIAM. The Family in Cross-Cultural Perspective. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

STILLINGER, JACK (Ed.). The Early Draft of John Stuart Mill's Autobiography. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961.

STINCHCOMBE, ARTHUR S. Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965.

STONE, RICHARD. A model of the educational system. Minerva, 1965, 3, 172-186.

TERMAN, LEWIS M., AND ODEN, M. H. The Gifted Child Grows Up, vol. IV of Genetic Studies of Genius. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1947.

THOMSON, GLADYS SCOTT. Life in a Noble Household. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1959.

TURNER, RALPH H. Sponsored and contest mobility in the school system. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 855-867.

WALLER, WILLARD. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: Wiley, 1932.

WATKINS, MARK H. The West African 'Bush' School. In Spindler (1963). Pp. 426-443.

WHITING, BEATRICE (Ed.). Six Cultures. New York: Wiley, 1963.

WHITING, JOHN W. M., KLUCKHOHN, R., AND ANTHONY, A. The function of male initiation ceremonies at puberty. In Maccoby, E. E., Newcomb, T., and Hartley, E. L. (Eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, 1958. Pp. 359-370.

WIENER, NORBERT. Ex-Prodigy. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953.

YOUNG, FRANK W. The function of male initiation ceremonies: a cross-cultural test of an alternative hypothesis. American Journal of Sociology, 1962, 67, 379-390.

ZELDITCH, MORRIS, JR. Cross-cultural analyses of family structure. In Harold T. Christensen (Ed.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964. Pp. 462-500.